

Exhibit B

Laura Mumm

From: Shirim Nothenberg
Sent: Tuesday, December 21, 2010 11:49 AM
To: Jessica Polansky; Daniel Dobies
Subject: FW: DRAFT MACWIS RFP - Comments from Grace Lopes

From: Grace M. Lopes [mailto:gmlopes@oymonitor.org]
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2009 8:19 PM
To: 'Rachal, Kenya Key'
Cc: 'Fortenberry, Rusty'; Shirim Nothenberg
Subject: RE: DRAFT MACWIS RFP - Comments from Grace Lopes

Kenya:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the draft of the RFP. In light of the fact that defendants would like the assessment required by the RFP to serve as the MACWIS assessment contemplated by Section I.e. of the Year-One Implementation Plan, I offer the following quick comments on and questions related to the draft RFP for defendants' consideration.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions. Many thanks, Grace

1. It might be helpful to include the settlement agreement and year-one implementation plan in the appendix to the RFP and to specifically direct prospective vendors to Section I.A.5.a. of the Settlement Agreement because it sets out the lawsuit's general information management requirements.
2. If the vendor's recommendation will be used as the basis for the plan to meet the needs identified during the MACWIS assessment that is required by Section I.A.5. of the year-one implementation plan, it might also be helpful to direct prospective vendors to this requirement and to clarify in the RFP that defendants are expecting the vendor to make recommendations related to content and timelines for the plan required by Section I.A.5. of the year-one implementation plan.
3. Page 34: The last sentence in the paragraph that ends at the top of the page should include a reference to the objectives in points 1 and 2, above, because defendants are also seeking to achieve compliance with the *Olivia Y* requirements.
4. Page 34, 2.2.1: A reference to supporting *Olivia Y* requirements should be added.
5. Page 34, 2.2.3: A reference to any future requirements in *Olivia Y* should be added.
6. Page 35: 2.3.3: The reference to the interface with the youth court should be reviewed for accuracy.
7. Page 35, 2.3.4: This section should be revised to include the requirements in Section I.A.5.a. of the Settlement Agreement.
8. Page 36, 2.3.6.1: I think the role contemplated by the Settlement Agreement extends substantially beyond tracking areas of improvement because the system's specific capabilities constitute substantive requirements and have management/CQI implications. In addition, the reference to requiring the vendor to incorporate the requirements of the lawsuit into proposed solutions might benefit from some explanation if defendants also plan to use the assessment for point 2, above.
9. Page 36, 2.3.6.2: The last sentence should be checked for accuracy.
10. Page 39, 3.3.1.4: The description should be checked for accuracy.
11. Page 39, 3.3.1.6: Limitations are acknowledged in this subsection, but not in others that also have limitations.

12. Page 39, 3.3.1.8: The description should be checked for accuracy.
13. Page 39, 3.3.1.9: The description should be checked for accuracy.
14. Page 40, 3.4: Has consideration been given to the Hotline in terms of the implication vis-à-vis new and planned operational changes in the Hotline?
15. Page 3.4.3.4: The description should be check for accuracy and whether a reference to the planned new youth court interface should be added.
16. Page 45, 5.3.1: The Olivia Y requirements should be added.
17. Page 46, 6.1.1: The Olivia Y requirements should be added.
18. Page 49, 6.1.4.1.6: Has consideration been given to the planned new youth court interface?
19. Page 50, 6.1.5: Will the exhibit include identified deficiencies that implicate the requirements in *Olivia Y*?
20. Page 58, 6.5.4.1: Clarify requirement is for a written gap analysis.
21. Page 58, 6.5.4.1.1: This statement is somewhat unclear and would benefit from some explanation.
22. Page 58, 6.5.4.1.3: The term “value” is somewhat unclear in this context and could be defined.
23. Page 58, 6.5.4.1.5: This statement is unclear and would benefit from some explanation.
24. Page 58, 6.5.4.2.1: The reference to “areas” would benefit from some explanation.
25. Page 59, 6.5.4.2.5: Same as 24, above.
26. Page 59, 6.5.5.1: Clarify that recommendations must be written and that the basis for each recommendation must be explained.
27. Page 59, 6.5.6.1: Are staffing requirements related to certain functions that should be specified?
28. Page 60, 6.5.8.1.3: The phrase “to the issue” is unclear. Are the recommendations intended to resolve the issues?
29. Page 60, 6.5.9: Should findings and recommendations be presented in writing and orally?
30. Page 63, 7.2.5.1: Clarify that the extent of prior SACWIS experience and the particularized expertise should be explained.
31. Page 64, 8.2: Is there a temporal limit on this requirement?
32. Page 64, 8.4: The term “conjunction” could lead to accountability problems and defendants may wish to consider requiring “consultation” instead unless the intent is a combined effort.
33. I note the contract document has a confidentiality requirement. Should there be a parallel reference in the RFP?

race M. Lopes
Monitor, Olivia Y.
1875 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 650
Washington, D.C. 20009
202.232.8311

This email and any attachments may contain confidential and privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately, destroy this email, and destroy any copies. Any dissemination or use of this information by a person other than the intended recipient is unauthorized and may be illegal.

From: Rachal, Kenya Key [mailto:krachal@bakerdonelson.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 12:16 PM
To: gmlopes@oymonitor.org; Shirim Nothenberg
Cc: Fortenberry, Rusty
Subject: DRAFT MACWIS RFP

Good Afternoon:

Attached is a copy of the MACWIS RFP (draft) prepared by MIS and DFCS MACWIS staff. As recommended by ACF, this RFP will be issued for the purpose of analyzing the capabilities of the current system and recommending whether it is best to update the present MACWIS system or replace it. Since the government will pay for half of the cost of this assessment, it would be great if this assessment can also serve as the MACWIS Assessment required by the Settlement.

As this is a rather large and technical document, the main parts you'll need to consider are sections 2, 6, 7, and 8. Please let me know your comments/thoughts as soon as you are able.

Thanks,
Kenya

Kenya Key Rachal

Of Counsel
Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, P.C.
4268 I-55 North
Meadowbrook Office Park
Jackson, Mississippi 39211
Telephone: 601.351.8940
Facsimile: 601.974.8940
E-mail: krachal@bakerdonelson.com
Website: www.bakerdonelson.com

Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, P.C. represents clients across the U.S. and abroad from offices in Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Tennessee, Washington, D.C. and a representative office in Beijing, China.

Under requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that, if any advice concerning one or more U.S. federal tax issues is contained in this communication (including in any attachments and, if this communication is by email, then in any part of the same series of emails), such advice was not intended or written by the sender or by Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (1) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (2) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or tax-related matter addressed herein.

This electronic mail transmission may constitute an attorney-client communication that is privileged at law. It is not intended for transmission to, or receipt by, any unauthorized persons. If you have received this electronic mail transmission in error, please delete it from your system without copying it, and notify the sender by reply e-mail, so that our address record can be corrected.

Laura Mumm

From: Shirim Nothenberg
Sent: Tuesday, December 21, 2010 11:49 AM
To: Jessica Polansky; Daniel Dobies
Subject: FW: DRAFT MACWIS RFP

From: Shirim Nothenberg
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 4:34 PM
To: 'Rachal, Kenya Key'; gmlopes@oymonitor.org
Cc: Fortenberry, Rusty; Jessica Polansky; Mavis Asiedu-Frimpong
Subject: RE: DRAFT MACWIS RFP

Kenya,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the draft MACWIS RFP. The MACWIS assessment required under the Implementation Plan is intended to examine how well the system is performing and, more specifically, to what extent the system is able to undertake the ten functions required under section II. 5 of the Decree as well as to provide the accurate and timely records required under section II.6. We note that the RFP currently mentions the need for MACWIS to incorporate the requirements of the Settlement, yet it is not clear that the RFP is specifically requesting the more detailed analysis expected by the MACWIS Assessment, which must be detailed enough to provide a basis for an implementation plan. While it would appear that, as currently drafted, the RFP is principally aimed at determining if MACWIS can capture and report upon federally required data elements, we see no reason why the RFP could not be edited to request the further assessments contemplated by the Settlement.

Shirim

From: Rachal, Kenya Key [\[mailto:krachal@bakerdonelson.com\]](mailto:krachal@bakerdonelson.com)
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2009 12:16 PM
To: gmlopes@oymonitor.org; Shirim Nothenberg
Cc: Fortenberry, Rusty
Subject: DRAFT MACWIS RFP

Good Afternoon:

Attached is a copy of the MACWIS RFP (draft) prepared by MIS and DFCS MACWIS staff. As recommended by ACF, this RFP will be issued for the purpose of analyzing the capabilities of the current system and recommending whether it is best to update the present MACWIS system or replace it. Since the government will pay for half of the cost of this assessment, it would be great if this assessment can also serve as the MACWIS Assessment required by the Settlement.

As this is a rather large and technical document, the main parts you'll need to consider are sections 2, 6, 7, and 8. Please let me know your comments/thoughts as soon as you are able.

Thanks,
Kenya

Kenya Key Rachal

Of Counsel
Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, P.C.
4268 I-55 North
Meadowbrook Office Park
Jackson, Mississippi 39211
Telephone: 601.351.8940
Facsimile: 601.974.8940
E-mail: krachal@bakerdonelson.com
Website: www.bakerdonelson.com

Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, P.C. represents clients across the U.S. and abroad from offices in Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Tennessee, Washington, D.C. and a representative office in Beijing, China.

Under requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that, if any advice concerning one or more U.S. federal tax issues is contained in this communication (including in any attachments and, if this communication is by email, then in any part of the same series of emails), such advice was not intended or written by the sender or by Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (1) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (2) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or tax-related matter addressed herein.

This electronic mail transmission may constitute an attorney-client communication that is privileged at law. It is not intended for transmission to, or receipt by, any unauthorized persons. If you have received this electronic mail transmission in error, please delete it from your system without copying it, and notify the sender by reply e-mail, so that our address record can be corrected.
